Wisconsin Educator Effectiveness System: User Guide for Teachers and Teacher Evaluators

[cover page]

Table of Contents

Introduction [Katie]

Evaluation Guide Organization

Wisconsin educators wrote and organized this teacher evaluation guide to help teachers, teacher evaluators, and coaches plan and carry out learning-centered teacher evaluations.

- The first section briefly describes five principles of a learning-centered evaluation approach.

- The second section starts with an overview of the Danielson Framework for Teaching and key evaluation process milestones.

- Following the overview, the third section walks through leveraging the evaluation process as a cycle of continuous improvement, including goal setting, ongoing evidence collection, data-focused reflection, and growth-oriented conversations and next steps.

- The last section turns to summarizing the evaluation results to inform the end-of-cycle conversation and propel learning forward.

- Examples are provided throughout to help illustrate key points, and the appendix includes resources to provide background information and resources supporting the teacher evaluation process.

Five Principles of Learning-Centered Evaluation

Evaluation systems, implemented in isolation as an accountability or compliance exercise, will not improve educator practice or student outcomes. Leader and teacher evaluation has the potential to improve practice *only* when five conditions are in place: 1) a foundation of trust that encourages educators to take risks and learn from mistakes; 2) a common, research-based framework on effective practice; 3) regular application of educator-developed goals based on data; 4) cycles of continuous improvement, guided by timely and specific feedback through ongoing collaboration; and 5) integration of evaluation processes within school and district improvement strategies.[1] Creating and maintaining these conditions helps move an evaluation system from an accountability and/or compliance exercise to a learning-centered, continuous improvement process.

Foundation of trust

Encouraging risk-taking requires conditions of trust. Effective schools develop and maintain trust between educators, administrators, students, and parents. In the evaluation context, creating conditions of trust first occurs during an orientation session, where teachers and their evaluators discuss transparently: 1) the evaluation criteria, or what rubric the evaluator will use to evaluate

---

[1] Research references for the 5 principles and other aspects of the Wisconsin evaluation process, including the Framework for Teaching, are included in the Appendix A.

the teacher; 2) the evaluation process, or how and when the evaluator will observe the teacher's practice; 3) the use of evaluation results; and 4) any remaining questions or fears. Administrators should encourage teachers to take risks that foster professional growth. No one should settle for an expedient route using easily-achieved goals. Taking risks to set high goals for their own practice and their students' growth will result in greater learning for teachers and their students. To support risk-taking, the evaluator should encourage this process by communicating that learning happens through struggles and mistakes and that such mistakes will not be "punished" using this learning-centered evaluation process. Evaluators can reinforce a growth orientation through open conversations that help teachers build on strengths and learn from mistakes.

Callout Box: **An Agreed-Upon Vision**.

Common, research-based framework

Wisconsin selected the 2013 Framework for Teaching (FfT) by Charlotte Danielson for use in its learning-centered evaluation because: 1) Danielson designed the FfT to support educator learning and growth; 2) research supports and evaluations validate the FfT; and 3) many Wisconsin districts have used the FfT for years. The FfT is a 4-level rubric which helps teachers identify their typical, current practice and map a path for continued reflection and growth.

Educator-developed goals

As active participants in their own evaluations, teachers set performance goals based on their analysis of school and student data, as well as assessments of their own practice using the FfT. These goals address student achievement priorities (referred to as the Student Learning Objectives) and self-identified needs for individual improvement (referred to as the Professional Practice Goals). The goals may have the most impact when they are connected and mutually reinforcing (e.g., "I will _____ so that students can _____). Evaluators, teacher peers, school staff, and even parents can provide information relevant to the goals and feedback to strengthen them.

Continuous improvement supported by timely feedback

A learning-centered evaluation approach facilitates ongoing improvement through regularly repeated continuous improvement cycles. Improvement cycles represent intentional instruction that involves goal-setting, collection of evidence related to goals, reflection, and revision. Some refer to this type of work as a Plan-Do-Study/Check-Act process. Each step in a continuous improvement cycle should seamlessly connect to the next step and be repeated as needed.

Collaborative conversations, coaching, and timely feedback from trained evaluators/coaches/peers strengthen continuous improvement cycles. With effective training, evaluators/coaches/peers and teachers can establish a shared understanding and common language regarding best practice, as well as ensure consistent and accurate use of the FfT when selecting evidence, identifying levels of practice, and facilitating coaching conversations. This guide, a first phase of training, supports the understanding of the FfT, evidence sources relative to the FfT rubric, and evaluation processes. Districts will augment this guide with local training

and Learn modules for teachers, as well as Focus training and calibration for evaluators. Districts build evaluators' feedback capacity and establish norms for consistent, actionable feedback.

Integration with district and school priorities

Evaluation based on self-identified goals helps personalize the process and creates some ownership of the results. The evaluation process becomes strategic when it *also* aligns with school and district priorities. Many districts have intentionally restructured professional learning opportunities to build on the common conception of teaching and leadership reflected in the Wisconsin Framework for Principal Leadership (WFPL, the principal professional practice rubric) and the FfT. For example, Franklin Public School District built the Educator Effectiveness System into the district's strategic plan (see EE in Action).

> *[**EE in Action**: The Franklin Public School District not only piloted and thoroughly trained educators and evaluators at the school level, but also trained district leaders and built the Educator Effectiveness System into the district's strategic priorities. Understanding by Design (UbD) represents a key district priority. At a summer leadership retreat, district leaders planned how School Learning Objectives could help meet district priorities for UbD and be supported by classroom visits. The leadership team also identified relevant Framework for Teaching components to reinforce UbD. Principals encouraged teachers to develop \aligned teacher SLOs either as individuals or as grade-level teams. The district also designed professional development and created a coaching strategy to provide ongoing educator support. Schools structured ongoing professional learning experiences anchored to the Framework for Teaching.*
>
> *For example, one school had all staff work on component 3b: Questioning and Discussion Techniques, during a staff meeting. Teachers then monitored their instruction from the lens of questioning and discussion over the next 3 weeks, then came back as a group to talk about progress, what they learned, and how they are adjusting their approach. The full group of faculty then talked about how they could move from proficient to distinguished practice in 3b and would try those strategies and share out at the next staff meeting.*
>
> *Additionally, principals provided individual feedback to teachers in the context of their goal setting and own evaluation process.]*

Drawing on the clear connections between the principal and teacher evaluation processes helps to strategically leverage the evaluation system. Wisconsin designed the principal and teacher evaluation processes to support principal, teacher, and school effectiveness by creating similar measures and structures. For example, aspects of the WFPL focus on leadership practices that help teachers achieve success in their practice.

The WFPL includes leadership components and indicators relating to how principals support effective teaching through school staffing strategies, professional development, teacher evaluation activities, and support of collaborative learning opportunities. The SLO processes for teachers and leaders also mirror each other. Should they choose, teachers and leaders can align goals to school priorities and reinforce efforts to advance school achievement (see Goal Alignment). Figure 1 illustrates the connections between the principal and teacher evaluation process.

*[**Goal Alignment**: Aligning goals is different than dictating goals. Even with strategically aligned goals, the educator should develop his/her own goal regarding something they control, based on his/her data, using assessments and practices authentic to his/her context. For example: A principal might identify literacy as a priority area for the school. A teacher in that school would still develop his/her SLO based on his/her subject area, grade-level, and student data, but might incorporate instructional strategies that address the identified content/skills within a literacy context, utilize a common writing rubric as one method of assessing subject-specific content/skills within a literacy context, etc.]*

Figure 1: Connections between teacher and principal evaluation processes

Teacher Effectiveness Cycle	Principal Effectiveness Cycle
Self-review based on teaching standards (FfT)	Self-review based on leader standards (WFPL)
Student Learning Objective	*School* Learning Objective
Professional Practice Goal	Professional Practice Goal
Evidence collection	Evidence collection
Observations	Observations
Collaborative conversations and formative feedback	Collaborative conversations and formative feedback
Goal review and assessment	Goal review and assessment
Measures of professional practice and SLOs	Measures of professional practice and SLOs

Teacher Evaluation Overview

Overview of the Framework for Teaching

For its learning-centered teacher evaluation rubric, Wisconsin selected Charlotte Danielson's 2013 Framework for Teaching, a research-based approach to assess and support effective instructional practices. The FfT organizes teaching practices into four domains and 22 components (see Figure 2). The FfT provides complete descriptions of the domains and components, as well as indicators and descriptions of performance levels. The following sections briefly describe the four domains.

Figure 2: Domains and components of the Framework for Teaching

Framework for Teaching	
Domain 1: Planning and Preparation	**Domain 2: Classroom Environment**
1a Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	**2a** Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport

1b Demonstrating Knowledge of Students **1c** Setting Instructional Outcomes **1d** Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources **1e** Designing Coherent Instruction **1f** Designing Student Assessments	**2b** Establishing a Culture for Learning **2c** Managing Classroom Procedures **2d** Managing Student Behavior **2e** Organizing Physical Space
Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities **4a** Reflecting on Teaching **4b** Maintaining Accurate Records **4c** Communicating with Families **4d** Participating in a Professional Community **4e** Growing and Developing Professionally **4f** Showing Professionalism	**Domain 3: Instruction** **3a** Communicating With Students **3b** Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques **3c** Engaging Students in Learning **3d** Using Assessment in Instruction **3e** Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness

Domain 1: Planning and Preparation

Domain 1 defines how a teacher organizes the instructional content (learning activities, materials, assessments, and strategies) in a manner appropriate to both the content and the learners. Teachers demonstrate components of Domain 1 through the plans that teachers prepare to guide their teaching. Evaluators can observe the use and impact of the plan through observations of practice in the classroom.

Domain 2: The Classroom Environment

Domain 2 describes the activities and tasks that establish a respectful classroom environment and productive culture for learning. The environment includes efficient routines and procedures, cooperative and non-disruptive student behavior, and organization of the physical space to support instruction. Evaluators primarily collect evidence for Domain 2 components through observations of the classroom, as well as related pre-and-post observation discussions.

Domain 3: Instruction

Domain 3 encompasses the instructional strategies used to successfully engage students in the content. These components represent distinct elements of instruction. Like Domain 2, evaluators primarily collect evidence of Domain 3 components through observations of classroom interaction and related pre-and-post observation discussions.

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

Professional Responsibilities describes the teacher's role outside the classroom. These roles include professional responsibilities such as self-reflection and professional growth, in addition to contributions made to the school, the district, and to the profession as a whole. The components in Domain 4 are demonstrated through classroom records, logs of professional development activities and parent contacts, and observations of teacher interactions with colleagues, families, and the community.

Alignment of teacher and principal evaluation systems

Wisconsin referred to the structure of the FfT during the development of the Wisconsin Framework for Principal Leadership. Both use critical attributes to describe four levels of professional practice (unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished). The content contained in both frameworks are mutually reinforcing, which is demonstrated in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Themes across frameworks

Content area	Framework for Teaching	Wisconsin Framework for Principal Leadership
Environment	2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport	2.2.1 School Climate 2.2.3 Conflict Management and Resolution
Culture	2b: Establishing a culture for learning	2.2.1 School Climate 1.2.2 Student Achievement Focus
Communication	3a: Communicating with students 4c: Communicating with families	2.2.2 Communication
Use of Data	3d: Using assessment in instruction	1.2.4 Schoolwide Use of Data 1.2.5 Student Learning Objectives (teacher SLOs)
Professional Growth	4d: Participating in a professional learning community 4e: Growing and developing professionally	1.1.4 Professional Development and Learning 2.1.3 Use of Feedback for Improvement

Performance levels

Figure 4, below, illustrates the four levels of performance for each component of the *Framework for Teaching*. Educators use the differentiated levels to identify levels of professional practice related to each component. Identifying practice related to a specific level aids in goal development, progress monitoring, and provides a consistent structure for conversations between the teachers, principals, and peers.

Figure 4: The levels of performance within the *Framework for Teaching*

			Distinguished (Level 4)
		Proficient (Level 3)	Refers to professional teaching that involves students in innovative learning processes and creates a true
	Basic (Level 2)	Refers to successful, professional practice.	

Unsatisfactory (Level 1)	Refers to teaching demonstrating the potential knowledge and skills necessary to be successful, but the application of is inconsistent (perhaps due to recently entering the profession or transitioning to a new curriculum, grade level, or subject).	Teaching practices consistently demonstrate proficiency.	community of learners. Teachers performing at this level are master teachers and leaders in the field, both inside and outside of their school.
Refers to teaching that does not convey understanding of the concepts underlying the component. This level of performance is doing harm in the classroom.			

Teachers typically demonstrate varying degrees of proficiency across the components. **This variation is expected.** While teachers likely expect perfection, no one teacher can perform at the highest levels at all times. New teachers may perform at the *Basic* level some of the time while working toward proficiency. Experienced teachers may be practicing at the *Proficient* level for most components most of the time. Teachers may be at the *Distinguished* level on some components, while demonstrating *Proficient* practice in other areas.

To focus on growth and improvement, evaluators and peers have found it helpful during conversations with educators to frame feedback around specific critical attributes within components. Providing general feedback at the domain or component level is probably less helpful than feedback specific to performance competencies at the critical attribute level within components. Focusing feedback at the critical attribute level contributes to more constructive dialogue because it is specific and can be linked directly to higher levels of practice, providing a foundation and roadmap for growth. The teacher can utilize the specific information to identify strengths to leverage across other components. Additionally, the teacher can define current practices needing growth, compare and contrast the practices within the current level to the desired level, and then make a specific plan to improve to the desired level.

Consistently applying this approach at the critical attribute level helps provide richer dialogue and actionable feedback relative to the components, leading to continuous improvement planning. The feedback informs adjustments to current strategies during the year, as well as informs future goals at the end of the year.

The full rubric may be downloaded from the Danielson Group website (see Appendix B for a direct link). A list of suggested evidence sources to assess performance according to the rubric appears in Appendix C.

Overview of the Educator Effectiveness Cycle

Wisconsin designed its learning-centered teacher evaluation process as a cycle of continuous improvement that includes goal development and regular (i.e., weekly) progress monitoring, reflection on goals, strategy adjustments, and action planning across the year. A teacher can

complete a one-year, two-year, or three-year process, known as the teacher's EE Cycle. District administrators determine the length of a teacher's EE Cycle (at a maximum of three years). However, teachers who are new to a district, and/or new to the position must complete a one-year cycle (see Appendix D). The final year of an EE Cycle (or the only year, if a one-year cycle) is called a Summary Year, because the teacher and his/her evaluator or peer collaboratively summarize practice across all years. The initial year, or years, (if a two or three-year cycle, respectively) are called Supporting Years.

Supporting Years emphasize collaborative discussions with a peer or peers around performance planning and improvement. In Summary Years, such collaborative discussions about performance planning and improvement also take place with the principal or other evaluator. These summary year discussions should include measures of practice based on the FfT, as well as measures of student learning, and the quality of the processes used throughout based on the SLO Scoring Rubric (see Appendix E).

Lessons learned from each EE cycle lead to the development of a teacher's following EE cycle. Each EE cycle includes formal check-ins in the form of beginning, middle, and end-of-year conferences with evaluators or peers. Although the formal check-ins provide a concrete step to keep the evaluation process on track, an informal process of regular (i.e., weekly) and collaborative data review, reflection, and adjustment characterizes sound professional practice.

Diagram of EE Cycle Milestones
Cynthia insert graphic

Overview of EE Cycle Milestones

Milestone	Focus
Orientation Meeting	Overview of the system measures and processes, identify who can provide support, discuss timelines and schedules. Occurs in August or September.
Develop Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP)	EEP includes one Professional Practice Goal and one Student Learning Objective and the supports needed to meet the goals. Occurs in September and October.
Planning Session	Review EEP, discuss and adjust goals if necessary. Identify evidence sources, actions, and resources needed. Occurs in September or October.
Ongoing Improvement Focus	Ongoing collaborative discussions, review of student and personal practice data based on collected evidence and observations, reflection, and adjustment.
Mid-Year Review	Review PPG and SLO, adjust goals if necessary. Occurs in December or January.

Continued Improvement Focus	Ongoing collaborative discussions, review of student and personal practice data based on collected evidence and observations, reflection, and adjustment.
Goal Outcomes	Determine degree of success in achieving SLO and PPG based on evidence. Self-score SLO. Evaluator can assign a holistic SLO score in Summary Years. Occurs in April or May.
End of Cycle Conversation and Conference	Receive feedback on PPG and SLO achievement, discuss results on components of FfT and SLO results. Identify growth areas for upcoming year. Occurs in May or June.

Starting the Educator Effectiveness Cycle of Improvement

Getting started: Orientation

Evaluators should provide teachers new to a district and/or entering a Summary Year with an Orientation. The Orientation allows teachers and their evaluators to discuss transparently: 1) the evaluation criteria, or FfT; 2) the evaluation process, or the ongoing continuous improvement cycles informed by evidence of teacher practice collected during observations; 3) the use of evaluation results; and 4) any remaining questions or fears. Administrators should encourage teachers to take risks that foster professional growth. To support risk-taking, the evaluator should encourage this process by communicating that learning happens through struggles and mistakes and that such mistakes will not be "punished" using this learning-centered evaluation process.

During the Orientation, the evaluator should also identify any school or district supports available to assist teachers with Summary Year processes (e.g., DPI process manuals, district handbooks, district training, and other resources) and to use the learning-centered evaluation process to continuously improve (e.g., ongoing and embedded structures for regular and collaborative data review, reflection, and action planning; mentors, coaches, etc.).

Self-Review

Completing a yearly self-review based on the FfT is considered best-practice. Self-reflection can help provide focus for the goal-setting processes in the Educator Effectiveness Plan.

Teachers who analyze and reflect on their own practice understand their professional strengths as well as their areas that need development. They combine analysis and reflection with collaboration to identify opportunities and challenges in their day-to-day work with students. Reflection also allows the teacher to consider how the needs of the students in an individual classroom can, and do, connect to the larger goals of the school. A growth mindset is as

important for the adults in the school as it is for the students, and applying goal-setting as part of a cycle of improvement can help align priorities and maximize impact.

[CALLOUT: *Educators in Baraboo School District use video as a tool for self-reflection. Teachers capture video using a device which automatically pivots to follow the teacher as they move throughout the room and interact with students. Some educators self-analyze the videos independently, while others work collaboratively with coaches, peers, and evaluators. Teachers also choose whether they upload the video as an artifact or not. The self-reflection process provides powerful evidence for the educator to use for his/her Educator Effectiveness Plan. One teacher stated that she used the video to look at her questioning technique and wait time so that she could appropriately modify her instruction.*]

The Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP)

Teachers create an Educator Effectiveness Plan (EEP) near the beginning of the school year that contains two different types of goals. The first, the Student Learning Objective (SLO), focuses on student academic learning. The second, related to teaching plans and instructional practices as outlined in the FfT, is the Professional Practice Goal (PPG). The teacher develops both goals after self-reflection and analysis of past student learning and professional practice data (i.e., his/her self-reflection and evidence of his/her own prior performance from past evaluations, if applicable). The teacher should develop goals distinctive to his/her professional practice and relevant to academic learning needs of the students in his/her classroom. As with any continuous improvement or inquiry cycle, data analysis and goal development serve as the initial steps.

Throughout the discussion of the goal development as well as the yearly goal milestones, an example EEP from a middle school history teacher is provided.

Student Learning Objective (SLO)

Wisconsin designed its SLO as a cycle of continuous improvement, which mirrors the Professional Learning Community (PLC) or similar inquiry/improvement cycle processes. In simplest terms, the SLO process asks a teacher to work collaboratively with a team or peer, as well as the evaluator in the Summary Year, to:
1. Determine an essential learning target for the year (or interval);
2. Review student data to identify differentiated student starting points and growth targets associated with the learning target for the year;
3. Review personal instructional practice data (i.e., self-reflection and feedback from prior years' learning-centered evaluations) to identify practices to leverage as well as those to improve in order to support students meeting the growth targets;
4. Determine authentic and meaningful methods to assess students' progress towards the targets, as well as how to document resulting data;
5. Review evidence of student learning and progress, as well as evidence of his/her own instructional practices;
6. Reflect and determine if evidence of instructional practices points to strengths which support students' progress towards the targets, or practices which need improvement;
7. Adjust accordingly;
8. Repeat regularly.

Every teacher writes at least one SLO each year. The teacher should view the SLO as a way to take small, yearly steps towards a larger improvement process. While the SLO does require an academic focus and a link to academic standards, it does not require a teacher to produce academic proficiency for all students (or a subgroup of students) in one year. Rather, it asks teachers to move student learning, in one identified area of essential learning, closer to that objective. Teachers discuss their SLOs collaboratively with a peer, team, or evaluator to regularly reflect and gather feedback. At the end of each year, the teacher reflects on his/her students' progress and his/her own practice across the year using the SLO Rubric (see Appendix E) and the FfT. The teacher draws upon this reflection to inform student and practice goals for the coming year. In the Summary Year, the teacher's evaluator reviews all SLOs as evidence of student progress and the teacher's continuous improvement practice across the EE Cycle using the SLO Rubric and provides feedback at the critical attribute level to inform areas of strength, as well as a strategic plan for improving any areas needing growth.

Writing the SLO

Creating a meaningful *and* achievable SLO is a challenging task. The SLO-writing process involves addressing the following key considerations:

- Rationale (or finding your focus)
- Learning content/grade level
- Student population
- Evidence sources
- Time interval
- Baseline data
- Targeted growth
- Instructional strategies and supports
- Implementation
- Monitor and adjust

Teachers will find it helpful to reference the SLO Quality Indicator Checklist as they write and monitor the SLO throughout the interval (see Appendix E). Teachers can also use this document to support collaborative conversations regarding the SLO across the interval.

Rationale

In this part of the process, teachers explain, through narrative and data displays, how data analysis and review led to identification of a specific focus for academic improvement. This synthesis *must* begin with a review of prior school data and trends to gain a clear understanding of the school's student learning reality and culminate with a review of *previous years'* classroom student learning data. Analysis and reflection of such prior classroom data (when available) is intended to help teachers identify their own strengths and challenges related to improving student learning. By 'looking backward,' a teacher may discover trends. For example, students across

years may typically perform well on the majority of academic standards, but consistently struggle with one or two standards. Or, perhaps the prior data shows outstanding learning success with low readers but little to no growth for accelerated readers. Reviewing trends allows the teacher to make connections between his/her own instructional practice and recurring trends regarding student progress. The critical understanding is that the teacher's SLO focus area relates more to improving weaker areas of classroom practice, than identifying the lowest achieving students entering the classroom. Without an understanding of how instruction has/has not impacted the learning of past students, it is unlikely that a teacher will select an appropriate or effective focus of improvement for the SLO.

Team SLOs

Sometimes teams of teachers who teach the same grade or content choose a common focus for their SLOs. This allows the team to collect and discuss data as well as the effectiveness of various instructional strategies in an ongoing, collaborative way. A potential drawback to team SLOs is that the identified focus for the team SLO may not actually be a weak part of practice for all team members. The strategy that one team member needs to *begin* doing may be something other teammates have already incorporated. In the end, there is no right or wrong answer about team SLOs, but the SLO *rationale* **must** be based on data (school and classroom) that led each individual teacher to the focus of the SLO. Importantly, teachers must then collect baseline data from the students in their individual classrooms and set their own growth targets based on the data.

SLOs and Initial Educators

Initial Educators, those new to the teaching profession, are faced with certain disadvantage because they do not have any prior data relative to their practice in the current assignment to help narrow the focus for the SLO. These teachers should reflect on the experiences they have had to help students learn academic content as part of their student teaching or in other fieldwork experiences.

Questions to ask when determining Rationale:

- In addition to state summative assessments, what other types of data (both qualitative and quantitative) are available?
- How have past students in my classroom fared academically?
- Taken together, what story or stories does this data tell?
- Where is my academic instruction strong? What appears to be working?
- Where does my academic instruction need to improve? What might be causing this?
- Are there particular subgroups that typically perform better or worse than others? Are there equity issues to consider?
- Where do I see trends over time or as patterns across assessments?
- What learning improvement goals have I had for my students?
- What strategies have I implemented?
- What successes or what barriers have I encountered in my attempts to improve student learning?

Insert Rationale example from EEP

Learning Content/Grade Level

Teachers link the focus of the SLO to the appropriate academic content standards and confirm that the focus (content) is taught or reinforced throughout the interval of the SLO. SLOs typically focus on high-level skills or processes rather than rote or discrete learning.

> [CALLOUT: **Identifying a focus for the SLO**. Look for processes or skills that meet at least one of the following tests:
> **Endurance** – Knowledge or skill that is useful across a lifetime (e.g., reading, explanatory writing, problem-solving, etc.)
> **Leverage –** Knowledge or skill that will be of value in multiple disciplines (e.g., research process, reading and interpreting graphs, critical thinking, etc.)
> **Readiness (for the next level) –** knowledge or skill that is necessary for the next grade or next level of instruction (e.g., concepts of print, balancing an equation, etc.)
>
> (Doug Reeves, 2002, *The Leader's Guide to Standards: A Blueprint for Educational Equity and Excellence*)]

Insert Learning Content example from EEP

Time Interval

The length of the SLO, called the *interval*, **must** extend across the entire time that the learning focus of the SLO occurs. For many teachers, the interval will span an entire school year (e.g., modeling in 3rd grade math, argumentative writing in U.S. history). For others, the interval might last a semester or possibly another length of time. Teachers will do well to consider the reality that a longer interval provides more time to apply, monitor, and adjust strategies to achieve higher levels of student learning.

Insert Time Interval example from EEP

Student Population

A thorough data analysis will almost always point to more than one potential area of focus for the SLO population. Ultimately, the teacher has discretion in choosing the population for the SLO. There is hardly ever only one, right answer. A teacher should narrow the focus to an area of academic instruction that he/she can improve with focus and persistence so that student learning increases.

Consider the following example. A High School teacher finds that for the past three years, a majority of students in her Biology class were unable to write a complete and thorough lab report by the end of the course. A very large, wide-open option is to include all students from all three of the current Biology sections as the SLO population. Another option might be to narrow the population to one section of Biology students. A third option might be to narrow it even more to attempt to close an ongoing achievement gap with a specific sub-group of students, such as special education students or English Language Learners, in one (or more) of the Biology sections.

A teacher's ability to set and achieve goals for improved levels of student learning closely align to experience and instructional expertise, and teachers will find themselves variously equipped to

engage in this process. Those newer to the work may find it helpful to have a more narrow population in the SLO. Those ready for a greater challenge can include larger populations by writing tiered SLOs that identify multiple groups within the larger population and assign differing starting points and growth expectations to each group.

A team, peer, or evaluator should advise a teacher struggling with writing an SLO to get started, reflect on what is working and what is not, and adjust accordingly. Teachers' SLOs and the associated processes will improve with practice. The main thing to remember is that teachers must support any choice made in developing an SLO with data. Teams, peers, or evaluators will provide feedback regarding the accuracy and appropriateness of the data analysis, reflection, and resulting SLO decisions. This feedback will help the teacher not only become better at developing SLOs, but also at using the same skills (i.e., data collection, analysis, reflection, and action planning) to drive student learning forward as part of the SLO and other school improvement goals.

CALLOUT BOX: *The process to improve the SLO is the same process used within the SLO to improve student outcomes. With this alignment, teachers learn best practices for the SLO, which supports learning of best instructional practices. Through the process, teachers ultimately improve at SLOs, which supports improvement in instructional practices.*

Questions to ask when identifying the student population:

- Do the data point to a particular group or groups of students that I should identify as the population for this SLO (a group that is further behind or who have chronic gaps)?
- If this group is very large, do I have the knowledge and expertise to write a tiered SLO?
- If this group is very large, is there a way to narrow the population contained in this SLO to make it more manageable?

[Text box for following "Busting Myths"]

The SLO requires the teacher to identify a population of students for focused improvement. Identifying a particular grade level or subgroup for an SLO <u>does not</u> mean that a teacher 'cares less' about some students or groups of students than others. The teacher purposefully identifies the population after a thorough consideration of past student learning data. It goes without saying that the teacher will think about and be concerned about the academic achievement of all students in his or her care!

Insert Student Population example from EEP

Evidence Sources (assessment)
Most teachers say that identifying the evidence source is the most difficult portion of the SLO process, especially for their first few years. Teachers must use interim assessments three times

across the year (or other interval) to measure student growth across the interval. There is no DPI requirement for teachers to use a "traditional test," or a test purchased from a vendor for their interim assessments. While at first glance purchased tests may seem attractive, a teacher (or principal if the decision is a schoolwide policy) must carefully weigh how closely the assessment actually measures the focus of the SLO, and consider other factors such as the cost of such assessments, the time it takes to administer them, and the impact of over-testing on students. Teacher-designed or teacher-team designed assessments have the advantage of being created specifically to test the content and/or skills being taught (the focus of the SLO), making them better able to identify and inform areas for instructional adjustment. These assessments may also feel more authentic to students if they take a form other than a "traditional test," reducing test anxiety or "burnout." Additionally, assessments designed by teachers also provide opportunities to build teacher (and leader) knowledge around assessment literacy.

MYTH BUSTER: DPI does NOT require educators to use standardized assessments for their SLOs. Additionally, an "assessment" does not have to look like a traditional "test." Educators can use rubrics to score student performance, conversations, writing tasks, portfolios, etc. Educators should use the assessment type which best and most appropriately assesses the identified content and/or skill.

> *[Callout: **Teacher Teams**. Teachers would benefit from participation in one or more teams that include as many combinations of the following options as possible: A) teachers in the same grade level and subject area; B) teachers in the same subject area but across grade levels; and/or C) teachers in the same grade level but across subject areas. Depending on the composition of any given teacher-team, the group can focus on: 1) specific content and skills within a given subject area (teachers of same subject and grade level); 2) specific skills or content necessary to support learning in a subject area in future grade levels (teachers of similar subject, differing grade levels); 3) specific skills necessary to support learning across subject areas (teachers of similar grade level, differing subject area); 4) or specific skills necessary to support learning across subject areas and in future grade levels (flexible team composition). While regular interaction with teams representing a combination of these populations is ideal, some very small schools or districts may have fewer combinations/options. In these schools or districts, teacher teams can create a rubric to assess key skills identified by the team that transcend subject area and/or grade level. Additionally, educators in these schools can connect virtually to networks of educators in similar roles.*
>
> *To impact student learning, teacher teams need regular, structured time to meet and collaboratively identify learning targets and assessments, review data, and create strategies to adjust instruction accordingly.]*

In addition to identifying or developing the interim assessment used three times to formally measure growth towards the SLO, teachers must also build in methods to keep tabs on student learning in an ongoing way. Teachers use more informal, formative practices on a daily basis to determine what their students know and can do. These practices serve two functions. First, formative practices remind teachers to implement the strategies and action steps identified within

the SLO. Second, formative practices allow teachers to regularly monitor and adjust instructional strategies. Teachers can more quickly identify successful instructional strategies and practices and leverage them, as well as unsuccessful practices to adjust or discard. This real-time adjustment allows teachers to have a greater impact on student learning. Teachers will find it helpful to consult with peers to identify one or more formative ways to monitor student learning throughout the interval.

Questions to ask when thinking about evidence sources:

- Do I currently have an assessment that will measure a given focus area?
- If not, can I, or my team, design an assessment to measure it?
- For every potential assessment: Is it…
    - Valid: How well does it measure the learning targets?
    - Reliable: Can this assessment provide accurate results regarding students' understanding of the targets? Is there a process to ensure that students performing at similar levels receive similar scores, regardless of who scores the assessment (e.g., common rubrics, training, etc.)?
- How will I monitor student learning along the way to measure the impact of the strategies without waiting for the middle or end of the interval?
- When will I analyze the student data, in relationship to evidence of my practice, to know whether my strategies are working?
- Who will I involve in this ongoing analysis and reflection?

Insert Evidence Sources example from EEP

Baseline Evidence
Near the beginning of the interval, the teacher gives the interim assessment to the students identified as the population for the SLO. Or, the interim assessment might be given to all students to help identify the SLO population. The data collected here is called the *baseline* and should be reported in your SLO documentation. The baseline marks the starting point for the population group.

Insert Baseline Evidence example from EEP

Targeted Growth
Teachers use the baseline data to set an end goal, called the *target*, for student learning. The end goal is the acquisition of specific knowledge and/or skills, not scores, grades, or levels from an assessment (i.e., improving specific literacy skills versus improving MAP Reading scores). However, the growth must be measured. The target identifies the amount of growth relative to specific knowledge and/or skills expected of students as measured using an identified assessment.

Remember: The assessment does not have to be a traditional test, but could use rubrics to measure skills displayed through writing, performance, portfolios, etc.

For teachers new to goal-setting based on student growth across time, setting the target may seem like an educated guess. Conversations with other teachers may provide insight into how

much growth a 'typical' student makes in a focus area in a year or other interval. Teachers who struggle to set the target should be reassured by the fact that the goal can be adjusted at mid-interval if it becomes apparent that it was set too high or too low.

Remember: The SLO process is intended to help improve data analysis, reflection, and action-planning skills across time to support: 1) improved SLO development; 2) improved outcomes for identified SLOs; and 3) use of the same skills in all continuous improvement efforts in the school moving forward.

Questions to ask when determining the target:

- How much growth towards the learning target has this population of students made in the past?
- Does the growth target I have set push me a little outside of my comfort zone and stretch all learners (i.e., my students and me)?
- Have I set thoughtful growth targets for each group with different starting points if I am writing a tiered SLO?

Insert Growth Target example from EEP

SLO Goal Statement (SMART Criteria)
A SMART goal is simply a type of goal statement written to include specific components. They are:

Specific: Identify the focus of the goal; leave no doubt about whom or what is being measured (e.g., all 2nd grade students reading at grade level, 10th grade special education students gaining proficiency with argumentative writing, etc.). *The focus of the SLO must be rooted in student academic learning.*

Measureable: Identify the Evidence Source (the one being used at the beginning, middle, and end of the interval to establish the baseline and measure growth). It is **not** advisable to have two assessments listed in the goal statement (e.g., reading at grade level as measured by A <u>and</u> B). This makes it more complicated to identify the growth made and whether or not the goal was attained. Keep it simple.

Attainable: Requires reflection/judgement. Does the goal seem achievable, but still represents a bit of a stretch? This speaks to the rigor of the process.

Results-based: The goal statement should include the baseline and target for all students/groups covered by the SLO. This may be included as a table or even in an attachment that *clearly* spells out what the starting point and expected ending point is for each student or group of students.

Timebound: The goal is bound with a clear begin and end time. For the SLO, restate the interval (e.g., September 2016 – May 2017).

Those new to SMART goal writing may find it helpful to underline each component in the goal to ensure all parts are included.

Insert Goal Statement from EEP

Instructional Strategies and Supports

Teachers should see the *strategies* as the key ingredient to SLO success. Strategies and supports are the **new** actions that will ultimately result in higher levels of learning (growth) for students. This calls upon the teacher to be thoughtful and develop a plan that will improve teaching, and thus, learning. It is important to understand that improved student learning will not occur if the teacher is not also learning (e.g., instructional strategies and skills). Simply identifying new strategies without supporting educators' ability to learn how to effectively use the strategies will not result in student growth.

> As stated by Tim Kanold, "It's not *just* about the students. In fact, it's really about student learning and growth *and* adult learning and growth, intricately woven together forever." (Kanold, 2011, p. 133)

It is critical to identify a **few**, key strategies that will lead to better results. Too many strategies are guaranteed to be lost in the day-to-day business of a school. Too few or the wrong strategies will not have any impact at all. Strategies that fit one classroom context may not work well in another. Educators must remember that even the most carefully thought out and crafted strategies may need to adjustment (or to be discarded) as the year goes on as part of continuously improving

Questions to ask when determining strategies:

- What am I doing or not doing that is leading students to the current data reality?
- What part of my teaching practice might be contributing to these results?
- What evidence do I have to support my answers to the questions above?
- What instructional actions can I take to move student learning forward? What do I need to start or stop doing?
- Do I have a colleague or mentor who could help me identify ways I might improve instruction?
- What kind of learning do I need and where can I get it?

Insert Strategies from EEP

Implementation

Even the most thoughtful, best written SLO will turn into well-intended fiction if the teacher does not implement the identified strategies. Some strategies are straight-forward, others are more complicated and will require multiple steps. Teachers who collaborate in an ongoing way about an unfolding SLO process will benefit from mutual accountability as well as the feedback and support that such collaboration provides.

Professional Practice Goal (PPG)

Teachers typically develop Professional Practice Goals (PPGs) around an area of improvement identified during their self-review. When developing a PPG, a teacher will also develop a year-long plan for goal attainment that includes activities and needed resources. Some teachers link the professional learning in the PPG to the changes they are attempting to implement in their SLO. This allows the teacher to examine data, determine the area of focus for the SLO, and then identify the type of professional learning necessary to meet these improved student learning outcomes.

Questions to ask when developing a PPG:

- What are my strengths/challenges as a teacher?
- How is my practice reflected in the *Framework for Teaching* rubric?
- What am I interested in learning/doing/improving?
- Does it make sense for me to connect my PPG to my SLO?
- Where can I build in meaningful networking and collaboration with colleagues?

Once developed, the teacher shares the PPG with a peer or an evaluator for reflective discussion. In collaboration, they continue to monitor PPG progress through evidence collection and reflection over the course of the year. The processes and conversations related to the PPG can also serve as evidence of a teacher's professional practice, as measured by the FfT.

For a discussion about PDP and EEP alignment, see Appendix F.

Insert PPG example from EEP

PLANNING SESSION AND ONGOING CONVERSATIONS

Collaborative Conversations Surrounding the SLO and PPG

Wisconsin embedded opportunities for collaborative conversations formally in the beginning, middle, and end of the year, but these conversations should continue informally throughout the year. The Planning (or Peer Review) Session serves as the first formal check-in that allows for conversations around goal development and goal planning. At the Planning (or Peer Review) Session, teachers receive support, encouragement, and feedback regarding their SLO and PPG processes. Collaborative conversations, such as those that happen as part of the Planning (or Peer Review) Session, encourage reflection and promote a professional growth culture.

The teacher prepares for these collaborative conversations by sharing his/her PPG and SLO with his/her peer or evaluator. When preparing for a Planning (or Peer Review) Session, teachers reflect on all of the questions they addressed as they developed their goals and identify where they need support.

Evaluators or peers preparing for these collaborative conversations review the PPG and SLO, develop feedback related to each goal, and identify questions that will foster a collaborative conversation. The WI learning-centered process stresses the need for collaborative conversations that will stretch thinking and foster educator growth. Peers or evaluators can foster such

conversations by using a coaching protocol that has three key elements: (1) validate, (2) clarify, and (3) stretch and apply.

Validate: What are the strengths of the SLO or PPG? What makes sense? What can be acknowledged?

Clarify: This involves either paraphrasing (to show that the message is understood and check for understanding) or asking questions (to gather information, clarify reasoning, or eliminate confusion).

Stretch and Apply: Raise questions or pose statements to foster thinking.

*[Callout: **Improving Coaching Conversations**: A cross-agency DPI work team is currently developing a coaching competencies framework to support districts' selection, training, and use of coaches in their continuous improvement processes.]*

A coaching protocol can be used to structure Planning (or Peer Review) Session conversations. For example:

Validate - I see you have done a thorough analysis of your school and classroom data. You clearly have dug into the *Framework for Teaching* and have been thinking about…

Clarify - So you decided to focus your PPG around learning more about student engagement because you realize that you always have this small group of students who don't seem to care and don't do their work. You have included the idea of learning ways to engage these students in the Strategies section of your SLO and you like the idea of connecting your SLO and PPG?

Stretch and Apply - Here is a list of some possible resources you might use as part of your learning. Here is a list of teachers who already implement these strategies that you can collaborate with. You could observe their instruction or have them model the practices in your classroom.

During the Planning (or Peer Review) Session, the evaluator and teacher discuss and agree upon evidence sources for both the SLO and PPG goals. And during a Summary Year, the evaluator and teacher discuss and plan possible observation opportunities and artifact collection in order to cover adequate evidence for the areas of practice included in the Summary Year evaluation.

MYTHBUSTER: DPI does not require schools or districts to use the DPI-created forms. DPI provides forms to support collaborative Educator Effectiveness conversations regarding the Planning Session, Observations, Mid-Year Review, and End-of-Cycle Conference. Districts can use any coaching protocol to support the discussions, and any method to document evidence from the discussions that best meets their needs.

Insert Planning Session feedback from EEP

Reflection and Refinement

Following the Planning Sessions, teachers have the opportunity to reflect further on their goals, make any refinements, and then begin to implement their strategies.

Insert Refinements to EEP

During the Educator Effectiveness Cycle of Improvement

Collecting Evidence

Both the evaluator and teacher collect evidence of practice and student growth throughout the year. Teachers and their evaluator or peer should have discussed, agreed upon, and planned for evidence collection at the Planning Session. See Appendix C for a visual summary of evidence collection.

Artifacts

Artifacts contain evidence of certain aspects of professional practice that may not be readily visible through an observation. Artifacts can be described as behind-the-scenes evidence. The evidence identified in artifacts demonstrate levels of professional practice related to the components of the FfT. Evaluators and teachers will use evidence from individual artifacts to inform goal monitoring and feedback, as well as discussions about levels of performance for related FfT components.

The table below provides example evidence sources and indicators related to a FfT component. As previously referenced, Appendix C provides possible evidence sources for each component of the FfT.

Figure 5: Example evidence sources for 1f: Designing student assessment

1f: Designing student assessment	
Evidence	Look-for
- Evaluator/teacher conversations - Lesson/unit plan - Observation - Formative and summative assessments and tools	- Uses assessment to differentiate instruction - Students have weighed in on the rubric or assessment design - Lesson plans indicating correspondence between assessments and instructional outcomes - Assessment types suitable to the style of

	outcome
	● Variety of performance opportunities for students ● Modified assessments available for individual students as needed ● Expectations clearly written with descriptors for each level of performance ● Formative assessments designed to inform minute-to-minute decision making by the teacher during instruction

[CALLOUT *Teachers in Baraboo School District began using video for self-review. After reviewing the videos, some teachers expanded the use to also capture evidence related to their evaluation. For example, one teacher stated that after reviewing the video she recorded as part of her self-review, she decided to do an additional recording of a guided reading lesson because the videos capture so many domains and components related to the FfT. The teacher was able to edit, highlight sections, and comment on aspects of the lesson that provided evidence for the evaluation process.]*

SLO Evidence

It is critical that teachers continually collect data related to the SLO continually through the formative methods identified when the SLO was developed. At the midpoint in the SLO timeframe, the identified assessment is also administered. It is equally critical that time is set aside to analyze and reflect on the ongoing data results and identify ways to appropriately adjust instruction accordingly to move student learning (and the SLO) forward. If the assessment is developed and administered collaboratively, then all staff involved and supporting the approach should engage in analysis and reflection on results. These conversations can help identify what is working, and what is not. Above all, the teacher should devise a way to ensure that the SLO is maintained as an organic, living document across the year by monitoring student progress and revising strategies as needed.

MYTHBUSTING DPI does not require "data" to be numbers or scores from standardized assessments or traditional "tests." "Data" refers to any facts gathered for reference or analysis. This refers to any evidence of student learning and growth in any format, as long as it is accurate, appropriate, and authentic.

Observations

Observations are a shared experience between a teacher and his/her evaluator or peer. Observations allow evaluators or peers to see teachers in action and provide the most direct method of obtaining evidence of practice.

Skilled observers understand that conducting high quality observations requires ongoing training and calibration so that teachers receive accurate and consistent growth-oriented feedback. The training also ensures that the evidence collected from the observation can be used to accurately assess professional practice.

During a Summary Year, multiple observations occur to allow for a comprehensive window into teaching practice and opportunities for ongoing feedback. Announced observations are situated between a pre-conference and post-conference between the teacher and evaluator.

Announced observation

A minimum of one formal announced observation must occur in the Summary Year. This is typically one 45 to 60-minute classroom observation, generally the length of a class period, but can also be comprised of two 30-minute observations. The purpose of the Announced Observation is to provide a comprehensive picture of teaching and opportunities for rich feedback at the FfT critical attribute level. Prior to an announced observation, the teacher and evaluator sit down for a pre-conference. They have a post-conference following the observation.

CALLOUT: Alternative: Teachers may choose to have more frequent but shorter observations if: 1) the total amount of time is, at least, equivalent (e.g., six 10 minute observations or four 15 minute observations); and 2) the purpose of the learning-centered process, one of ongoing and collaborative conversations for growth, remains.

Pre-conference

The pre-conference allows teachers to set the stage for the observation and what the evaluator should expect to see and hear. It provides essential evidence of a teacher's skill in planning a lesson. The discussion also allows the teacher to focus the evaluator on any areas that might benefit from feedback. This sets the stage for the evaluator to better support the teacher following the observation.

CALLOUT Alternative: If teachers choose to receive more frequent but shorter observations, the pre-conference would not provide details of any specific day's lesson, but would instead allow the teacher to focus the evaluator on any areas identified through self-reflection that might benefit from feedback across the year.

Post-conference

The post-conference also plays an important role in the observation process. The discussion enables the evaluator to learn about the teacher's thinking about the lesson, what went well, and how it could be improved. This is when an evaluator can use questions to support the teacher in the type of reflective practice that will support continuous improvement.

CALLOUT Alternative: If the teacher chooses to have more frequent but shorter observations, the post-conference would remain, but would likely shorten in duration.

Mini-observation

Mini-observations are short observations, typically spanning about 15 minutes each. Three to five mini observations occur over the course of a full EE Cycle and at least two occur during a Summary Year. Mini-observations combined with the announced observations allows for a more detailed and timely portrait of teaching practice and creates multiple opportunities for feedback and improvement with regard to the critical attributes embedded within each component.

Tips and Considerations for Conducting Principal Observations

Focus on what's important and what's immediate. To maximize impact and relevance of feedback, evaluators should ask teachers what they most desire feedback on and what practices they would most like the evaluator to observe.

Manipulate time and/or remain invisible. The presence of an evaluator may affect how the teacher or the teacher's students behave. Evaluators could avoid this by using a variety of observation methods, including asking teachers to record themselves in action and submit links/videos for their evaluators to review. This method not only removes anxiety for the teacher, but can also address scheduling/capacity of the principal by removing the requirement for the evaluator to observe the practice in real-time.

Use High-Leverage Evidence Sets. High-leverage evidence sets result from intentional and strategic collection and use of observations and artifacts. These evidence sources differ from a random collection of artifacts or observations that are then retroactively assigned to components (i.e., lists of parent phone contacts without describing the impetus or results; lesson plans with no context or reflection; PD session attendance record with no agenda or evidence of how learning was utilized).

Isolated or random evidence sources may provide little insight about professional practice, insufficient information to evaluate individual components, and have little strategic value in and of themselves. In contrast, high-leverage evidence sets help illustrate professional practice as it deeply informs instruction, providing a rich basis for reflection and growth.

A high-leverage set covers multiple components. As a result, teachers may potentially collect fewer evidence examples, which can ease the burden for the teacher. Additionally, high-leverage sets ease the burden of the evaluator, who otherwise has to try to figure out what all the disparate artifacts tell about instruction. As an example, a high leverage artifact set could include: a) unit plan; b) lesson plan related to the unit; c) live observation or video of classroom instruction based on the lesson plan in (b); d) an assignment from the lesson or unit; e) teacher feedback on student work from the assignment; and f) teacher reflection on lesson.

CALLOUT: Alternative: Evaluators and teachers will be less likely to collect high-leverage evidence sets using the more frequent but shorter observations.

The table below provides examples of types of observations and artifacts that may be combined into high-leverage evidence sets.

Figure 6: Examples of observation and artifacts that may be combined into high-leverage evidence sets

Example of aligned observations and artifacts	Relevance to multiple components
Lesson plan; assessment used during the related unit or lesson; classroom observation; pre- and post-conference conversations; teacher reflections	1a: Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy 1b: Demonstrating knowledge of students 1c: Setting instructional outcomes 1d: Demonstrating knowledge of resources 1e: Designing coherent instruction 1f: Designing student assessment 3c: Engaging students in learning 3d: Using assessment in instruction
Observation of PLC participation during assessment design; formative/summative assessment tools; lesson plan; and reflection	1c: Setting Instructional Outcomes 1f: Designing student assessments 4d: Participating in the professional community 4e: Growing and developing professionally 4f: Showing professionalism AND may provide evidences towards the SLO process.

Mid-Year Review and Ongoing Conversations

Professional conversations continue regularly and informally throughout the EE cycle. The Mid-Year Review is one of three formal check-ins built into the Wisconsin learning-centered evaluation during which professional conversations occur. At the Mid-Year Review, teachers converse with their evaluator and/or peer about evidence collected and observed up to this point in the year. Teachers prepare for the Mid-Year Review by reviewing progress towards goals (i.e., SLO and PPG) based on evidence collected, assessing strategies used to date, and identifying any adjustments to the goal and/or strategies used, if necessary. They then provide their peer or evaluator a mid-year progress update.

Questions to ask when preparing for the Mid-Year Review:

- What does the evidence I have collected tell me about the progress of my goals?
- Am I on track to achieve my goals?
- Do I need to adjust my strategy so that I can achieve my goals?
- What evidence can help identify which strategies need adjustment?
- What support do I need to achieve my goals?

Peers and evaluators prepare for the Mid-Year Review by reviewing the teacher's progress towards goals, including evidence collected and strategies used to date, as well as developing formative feedback questions related to the goals.

Evaluators or peers can use a coaching protocol to structure middle-of-the year conversations. For example:

> *Validate* - Your lesson planning consistently details how you expect to monitor student learning progress both through ongoing formative steps during instruction and at key points across lessons.

> *Clarify* - What are some ways you have incorporated what you are learning from those assessments into your instruction?

> *Stretch and Apply* - Have you considered sitting down with the other 4th grade teachers to ask about how they are able to use formative assessments to inform their real-time instruction?

During the Mid-Year Review, teachers and their peer or evaluator also collaboratively review collected evidence in order to situate their learning-focused conversation around the components of the FfT and the SLO rubric.

Insert Mid-Year Review EEP update

Conversations about Professional Practice

Teachers and evaluators base conversations about professional practice on collected evidence from observations and artifacts, aligned to the FfT. Collaborative conversations grounded in the FfT increase the possibility for authentic and meaningful professional growth. For example, when a teacher and evaluator reflect on collected evidence, review the FfT together, and agree upon the level of performance, they can also jointly identify strategies for moving practice to the next level. Critical attributes in the FfT provide direction for improving practice.

Evaluators and peers have found it helpful during conversations with educators to frame feedback around specific critical attributes. Providing general feedback at the domain or component level (i.e., "you should focus more on demonstrating knowledge of your students") is probably less helpful than feedback specific to performance competencies at the critical attribute level (e.g., "You demonstrated awareness of different ability levels in your class but continued to teach to the whole group. Have you tried identifying high, medium, and low groups of students within your class?"). Consistently applying this approach at the critical attribute level helps provide richer dialogue and actionable feedback relative to the teacher components, leading to continuous improvement planning. The feedback informs adjustments to current strategies during the year, as well as informs future goals at the end of the year.

Conversations about SLOs

Teachers and evaluators base conversations about SLOs on collected evidence that demonstrate student growth and practice related to SLO processes. Evaluators and principals use the SLO Rubric and associated Quality Indicator Checklist (Appendix E) collaboratively as a tool to help assess progress and discuss any possible strategy changes. Data collected from teacher

observations should yield important insights into practices that influence the progress and success of the SLO and help identify practice adjustments needed to meet the SLO goal.

Collaborative Conversations Support Process and Serve as Evidence of Practice

Conversations about the processes and strategies that a teacher has utilized to work toward SLO achievement can and should be used as evidence of professional practice. For instance, an SLO based on teacher-developed assessments that are used, interpreted, and refined both individually and with peers, provides evidence for components 1f: Designing student assessments; 3d: Using assessment in instruction; and 4d: Participating in a professional community.

CALLOUT: If the school implements high-quality PLC/inquiry/team practices with fidelity on an ongoing basis, the teacher can collect evidence of practice and SLOs without adding additional processes.

Feedback and Coaching based on the Framework for Teaching

As discussed above, evaluators and peers should focus conversations at the component or, ideally, the critical attribute level, to provide the most meaningful and specific feedback while focusing on practice and not the person.

To support ongoing, continuous improvement, feedback must not only be specific and comprehensive, but also regular (i.e., more often than the three formal EE check-in meetings) and timely, so that teachers can adjust strategies and practice according to data and evidence. When teachers participate in regular, ongoing evidence-based professional conversations, the feedback is invaluable because it is relevant to their practice and can be immediately acted upon and impact their goals and performance. While the EE Cycle requires several formal feedback sessions (e.g., Planning Session, Mid-Year Review, Post-Observation, and End of Cycle), formative feedback sessions with a peer or evaluator should occur on a regular basis.

(*Remember: The process is not intended to label practice and then identify relevant professional development at the end of the year, but instead to BE professional development by identifying and informing needs in real-time to allow for specific adjustments to improve practice and impact student learning.*)

Learning-centered conversations are transparent, predictable, and support ALL learners (i.e., adults and students), thereby building trust in the process and enhancing results. Teachers who are in a supportive culture that embraces continuous growth and risk-taking will excel in advancing their professional practice. Evaluators and peers help to establish a supportive culture by being thoughtful and purposeful in the types of coaching questions they ask, by providing timely and relevant feedback, and by working collaboratively with teachers.

Reflection and Revision

Throughout the EE cycle, teachers regularly reflect on their practice and assess their goal progress. The Mid-Year Review is only one point in time where those things occur. After having any collaborative conversations and reviewing evidence, teachers should reflect, identify strengths and weaknesses, and select appropriate strategies to move forward.

Toward the End of the Educator Effectiveness Cycle of Improvement

Evidence Collection

At the end of each year, teachers review evidence collected during the cycle that supports their PPG and SLO and represents professional practice related to the FfT. Teachers in a Summary Year ensure that they have collected evidence related to each of the components of the FfT. Teachers in all years ensure that they have evidence that demonstrates their progress and successes in achieving their PPG and SLO. SLO evidence will include the final assessment given to the population identified in the SLO.

MYTHBUSTING: DPI does not require teachers to collect a certain number of artifacts for each component. Teachers should strategically identify high-leverage evidence sets that relate to more than one component, and fill in gaps with other evidence as needed, to illustrate practice.

Completing the SLO

After collecting and reviewing evidence, teachers self-score each of the six SLO critical attributes using the SLO Rubric and Quality Indicators Checklist (Appendix E). Assessing the SLO requires a teacher to reflect on student progress and their SLO process and can provide insight about ways to improve both moving forward. This self-assessment becomes evidence of the teacher's ability to accurately reflect on their practice and its impact on student progress, which the evaluator will use in the Summary Year.

In a Summary Year, the evaluator reviews all available SLOs (3 in a typical 3-year cycle, only 1 for a first-year teacher) and identifies the level of performance for each of the six SLO critical attributes using the SLO Rubric and Quality Indicators Checklist (Appendix E). Evaluators can assign a single holistic score by identifying the level of performance selected for most of the six SLO critical attributes. The evaluator should prepare notes for the End-of-Cycle Conference to support conversations and reflections at the SLO critical attribute level in order to provide the most specific and actionable feedback to inform changes in the teacher's practice.

End of Cycle Conference and Conversation

Teachers prepare for the end of cycle conference by sharing with their evaluator/peer results of their PPG and SLO. In a Summary Year, teachers also share FfT evidence.

Questions to ask when preparing for the End of Cycle Conference:

- What does the evidence I have collected tell me about the results of my goals?
- Did I achieve my goals?
- If not, why did I not achieve my goals?
- If yes, why did I achieve my goals?

Evaluators and peers prepare for the End-of-Cycle conference by reviewing goal results, including evidence collected, and developing formative feedback related to the goals. In a Summary Year, the evaluator also assigns a holistic SLO score. As previously noted, it is likely that documents and evidence supporting the PPG and SLO processes will also provide evidence of principal professional practice and can support conversations and feedback associated with multiple FfT components. The evaluator could prepare notes that align feedback for goals and feedback for professional practice to more effectively and efficiently structure the End-of-Cycle conference.

Drawing upon the evidence and prepared feedback, evaluators and peers also develop questions that will promote a collaborative conversation. Again, the coaching protocol can be used to structure the End-of-Cycle conversation. For example:

Validate - You've done a lot of specific reflecting about your SLO.

Clarify - Your thinking and discussion about your SLO has substantially evolved over the semester. At the beginning you believed that you could work with teachers in the literacy PLC to achieve your SLO. Unfortunately, your colleagues did not have adequate time to plan out the instructional changes or carry them out in the classroom. As a result, you did not meet your SLO goal.

Stretch and Apply - You've talked about the challenges you faced by using the post-course assessment as the growth measure for your SLO. What might you have done differently?

During the conference, the evaluator and teacher collaboratively review evidence, goal results, and possible next steps. In a Summary Year, the evaluator shares levels of performance for the SLO and the 22 FfT components. By discussing feedback at the critical attribute level, the evaluator and teacher can not only identify a few areas of focus (components) for the coming EE Cycle, but also develop a strategic plan based on actionable changes (strengths to leverage and areas to improve) informed by the critical attributes within the identified components. As teachers collaboratively reflect on their EE Cycle during the conference, they can use the lessons they have learned to discuss and begin to plan for a new cycle.

Insert End of Year EEP update

Reflections and Next Steps

Reflection includes identifying performance successes and areas for performance improvement. Teachers should review performance achievements to identify factors that contributed to success, which of those factors they can control, and then take steps to continue those controllable factors in the next cycle. Teachers should reflect upon areas that need improvement to identify potential root causes and possible teaching strategies for overcoming the identified root causes in the future. Reflections should not only occur within the context of what is needed for individual growth, but also within the context of school and district improvement strategies. The next steps that emerge from reflections for individual improvement can be aligned to school and district improvement strategies and set the stage for the next year's EE process.

It is inefficient and ineffective to try to improve quality indicators in all 22 components. As a teacher prepares for a new EE Cycle, he/she should work with his/her evaluator or peer to identify an area (or areas) of needed improvement for focus in the coming year(s).

Appendices

A.   Research Base
B.   2013 Danielson Framework for Teaching
C.   Evidence Sources and Guidance
D.   Wisconsin Statutory Language Regarding Personnel Evaluations
E.   SLO Rubric and Quality Indicators
F.   PDP and EEP Alignment

Appendix A: Research Supporting the Teacher Evaluation Process and the Framework for Teaching

Trust

Trust between educators, administrators, students, and parents is an important organizational quality of effective schools.

Example citations

Bryk, A.S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Tschannan-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(4), 547-93.

Goal setting

Public and private sector research emphasizes the learning potential through goal setting.

Example citations

Locke, E. & Latham, G.P. (1990). A theory of goal setting and task performance. New York: Prentice Hall.

Latham, G.P., Greenbaum, R.L., and Bardes, M. (2009). "Performance Management and Work Motivation Prescriptions", in R.J. Burke and C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *The Peak Performing Organization*. London: Routledge. pp. 33-49.

Locke, E.A., & Latham, G.P. (2013). *New Developments in Goal Setting and Task Performance.* London: Routledge.

Observation/evaluation training

Research and evaluation studies on teacher evaluation have pointed to the need for multiple observations, evidence sources, and training to provide reliable and productive feedback.

Example citations

Archer, J., Cantrell, S., Holtzman, S.L., Joe, J.N., Tocci, C.M., & Wood. J. (2016). *Better feedback for better teaching: A practical guide to improving classroom observations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gates Foundation, (2013). Measures of effective teaching project. *Ensuring fair and reliable measures of Effective Teaching: Culminating findings from the MET Project's three-year study*.

Available at: http://k12education.gatesfoundation.org/teacher-supports/teacher-development/measuring-effective-teaching/

Coaching, Support and Feedback

Bloom, G., Castagna, C., Moir, E., & Warren, B. (2005). *Blended coaching: Skills and strategies to support principal development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analysis relating to achievement*. New York: Routledge.

Kluger, A.N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 119*(2), 254-284.

Lipton, L, Wellman, M. (2013). *Learning-focused supervision: Developing professional expertise in standards-driven systems*. Charlotte, VT: MiraVia, LLC.

Framework for Teaching

Danielson, C., & McGreal, T.L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching, 2nd Edition*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Gates Foundation (2013). *Measures of effective teaching project, Ensuring fair and reliable measures of Effective Teaching: Culminating findings from the MET Project's three-year study*.Available at: http://k12education.gatesfoundation.org/teacher-supports/teacher-development/measuring-effective-teaching/

Milanowski, A.T., Kimball, S.M., & Odden, A.R. (2005). Teacher accountability measures and links to learning. In R. Rubenstein, A.E. Schwartz, L. Stiefel, and J. Zabel (Eds.), *Measuring school performance & efficiency: Implications for*

practice and research, 2005 Yearbook of the American Education Finance Association. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Sartain, L., Stoelinga, S.R., & Brown, E.R. (2011). *Rethinking teacher evaluation in Chicago: Lessons learned from classroom observations, principal-teacher conferences, and district implementation*. Consortium on Chicago School Research, University of Chicago.

Taylor, E.S., & Tyler, J.H. (2012). The effect of evaluation on teacher performance. *American Economic Review*, 102(7), 3628-3651.

Appendix B: Framework for Teaching Rubric

The 2013 Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument

(The Danielson Group, 2013)

The 2013 edition of the FFT Evaluation Instrument incorporates improved language in response to feedback from the field. Charlotte Danielson has met with teachers, supervisors, and researchers across the country to learn about the current issues with teacher evaluation systems and student achievement.

The full FFT may be downloaded FREE from the Danielson website:

http://www.danielsongroup.org/books-materials/

Educator Effectiveness SYSTEM
IMPROVE SUPPORT. IMPROVE PRACTICE. IMPROVE OUTCOMES.

Evidence Guidance for Teachers

I. Observations & Artifacts

DPI Model This document describes DPI model requirements and processes related to collection of evidence through Observations and Artifacts.

		Definition	Requirement	Specifics	Tips for Success
REQUIRED	**Announced Observation (s)** (long)	A pre-announced observation of the educator by his/her evaluator, to gather evidence of educator practice.	Per school year: 1 class period-length observation (approx 45–60) or 2 shorter observations (approx 25-30 each)	1) Pre-observation conference 2) Observation 3) Post-observation conference	• Observations should generate evaluative evidence that a) Is specific to the educator, and b) can be tagged to a component • Teachers or evaluators may upload artifacts to support the observation before or after the event. • Evidence may come from any part of the observation process (pre- or post-conferences, observation, reflections on the observation).
	Mini-observations (short)	Unannounced observations of the educator by his/her evaluator, to gather evidence of educator practice.	Per Effectiveness Cycle: 3-5 mini observations (Note: A minimum of 2 mini-observations must occur during the Summary Year)	1) Unannounced observation 2) Feedback provided within one week 1	• During a Supporting Year, peers may conduct mini-observations for formative practice. • Districts may use district-created tools for mini-observations.[25]
Not Required	**Classroom Walk-through**	Observing a specific idea, theme, trend, initiative or topic across multiple classroom or contexts (usually building-wide)	5-10 min As often as the building administrator or other administrator feels is necessary	Evaluator uses a district-created or approved tool. Brief feedback after the walk-through is optional.	• NOT required by WI EE System or the DPI Model • NOT intended to be used primarily for evidence collection on specific educator practices. • Fidelity information or other broad view of theme, trend, or topic • Districts may use their own or an adapted walk-through tool
REQUIRED	**Artifacts** (High-leverage artifact sets)	Items that contain evidence of demonstrated Educator Practice and/or the SLO. *DPI recommends grouping artifacts into "high leverage artifact sets" to contextually (and most efficiently) document evidence.*	Per school year: Evidence to support the SLO Evidence of Educator Practice Per Effectiveness Cycle: Evidence of all 22 Educator Practice components Evidence of all SLO's completed within the cycle	Upload as often as possible.	• Collecting Artifact Sets: One well-planned lesson can usually be mined for multiple artifacts. For example, a "high leverage artifact set" might include a lesson plan, student worksheet, list of discussion questions, and assignment rubric. When reviewed together as a set, these items offer context and evidence for multiple educator practice components. • Artifact evidence should always be tagged to a specific rubric component, or to the SLO. • This process may be teacher or evaluator driven.

[1] Evaluators may provide feedback using the most appropriate method at their disposal. Recommendation: Deliver feedback in ways that can be documented electronically.

[2] District-created mini-observation tools must capture and document observable evidence of specific teacher practices.

Evidence Guidance for Teachers

II. Component-related Evidence & Sources

DPI Model

This document is designed to facilitate teacher collection of evidence for support of professional practice. It identifies indicators related each component of the Danielson *Framework for Teaching*, and sources that are likely to contain the supporting evidence.

Under the WI Educator Effectiveness Plan, teacher professional practice is evaluated using the Danielson Framework for Teaching, research-based set of components of instruction, aligned to the INTASC standards, and grounded in a constructivist view of learning and teaching. The Framework examines the complex activity of teaching through the lens of 22 measurable components. The components are clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility.

Domain 1: Planning and Instruction

1a Demonstrating Knowledge of Content & Pedagogy	
Indicators / "Look-fors"	Evidence/Evidence Source
▪ Adapting to the students in front of you	▪ Evaluator/teacher conversations
▪ Scaffolding based on student response	○ Guiding questions, documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection.)
▪ Teachers using vocabulary of the discipline	▪ Teacher/student conversations
▪ Lesson and unit plans reflect important concepts in the discipline and knowledge of academic standards	▪ Lesson plans/unit plans
▪ Lesson and unit plans reflect tasks authentic to the content area	▪ Observations
▪ Lesson and unit plans accommodate prerequisite relationships among concepts and skills	○ Notes taken during observation
▪ Lesson and unit plans reflect knowledge of academic standards	
▪ Classroom explanations are clear and accurate	
▪ Accurate answers to students' questions	
▪ Feedback to students that furthers learning	
▪ Interdisciplinary connections in plans and practice	

1b Demonstrating Knowledge of Students

Indicators / "Look-fors"	Evidence/Evidence Source

▪ Artifacts that show differentiation and cultural responsiveness
▪ Artifacts of student interests and backgrounds, learning style, outside of school commitments (work, family responsibilities, etc.)
▪ Differentiated expectations based on assessment data/aligned with IEPs
▪ Formal and informal information about students gathered by the teacher for use in planning instruction
▪ Student interests and needs learned by the teacher for use in planning
▪ Teacher participation in community cultural events
▪ Teacher-designed opportunities for families to share their heritages
▪ Database of students with special needs
	▪ Evaluator/teacher conversations
	  ○ Guiding questions
	  ○ Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)
	▪ Lesson plans/unit plans
	  ○ Observations
	▪ Notes taken during observation
	▪ Optional
	  ○ Student / Parent surveys

1c Setting Instructional Outcomes

Indicators / "Look-fors"	Evidence/Evidence Source

▪ Same learning target, differentiated pathways
▪ Students can articulate the learning target when asked
▪ Targets reflect clear expectations that are aligned to grade-level standards
▪ Checks on student learning and adjustments to future instruction
▪ Use of formative practices and assessments such as entry/exit slips, conferring logs, and/or writer's notebooks
▪ Outcomes of a challenging cognitive level
▪ Statements of student learning, not student activity
▪ Outcomes central to the discipline and related to those in other disciplines
▪ Outcomes permitting assessment of student attainment
▪ Outcomes differentiated for students of varied ability
	▪ Evaluator/teacher conversations
	  ○ Guiding questions
	  ○ Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)
	▪ Lesson plans/unit plans
	▪ Observations
	  ○ Notes taken during observation

1d Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources

Indicators / "Look-fors"

- Evidence of prior training
- Evidence of collaboration with colleagues
- Evidence of teacher seeking out resources (online or other people)
- District-provided instructional, assessment, and other materials used as appropriate
- Materials provided by professional organizations
- A range of texts, internet resources, community resources
- Ongoing participation by the teacher in professional education courses or professional groups
- Guest speakers
- Resources are culturally responsive

Evidence/Evidence Source

- Evaluator/teacher conversations
  - Guiding questions
  - Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)
- Lesson plans/unit plans
- Observations
  - Notes taken during observation lesson plan

1e Designing Coherent Instruction

Indicators / "Look-fors"

- Grouping of students
- Variety of activities
- Variety of instructional strategies
- Same learning target, differentiated pathways
- Lessons that support instructional outcomes and reflect important concepts
- Instructional maps that indicate relationships to prior learning
- Activities that represent high-level thinking
- Opportunities for student choice
- Use of varied resources - Thoughtfully planned learning groups
- Structured lesson plans
- Creation/curation/selection of materials

Evidence/Evidence Source

- Evaluator/teacher conversations
  - Guiding questions
  - Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)
- Lesson plans/unit plans
- Observations
  - Notes taken during observation
- Optional
  - Pre observation form
  - Learning targets
  - Entry / exit slips or other formative assessments

1f Designing Student Assessments

Indicators / "Look-fors"	Evidence/Evidence Source
▪ Formative assessments designed to inform minute-to-minute decision making by the teacher during instruction	▪ Evaluator/teacher conversations
▪ Students have weighed in on the rubric or assessment design	○ Guiding questions
▪ Lesson plans indicating correspondence between assessments and instructional outcomes	○ Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)
▪ Assessment types suitable to the style of outcome	▪ Lesson plans/unit plans
▪ Variety of performance opportunities for students	▪ Observations
▪ Modified assessments available for individual students as needed	○ Notes taken during observation
▪ Expectations clearly written with descriptors for each level of performance	▪ Optional
	○ Formative and summative assessments and tools (i.e. rubrics, scoring guides, checklists)
	○ Student developed assessments

Domain 2: The Classroom Environment

2a Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport

Indicators / "Look-fors"	Evidence/Evidence Source
▪ Active listening	▪ Evaluator/teacher conversations
▪ Response to student work: Positive reinforcement, respectful feedback, displaying or using student work	○ Guiding questions
▪ Respectful talk, active listening and turn taking	○ Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)
▪ Acknowledgement of students' backgrounds and lives outside the classroom	▪ Observations
▪ Body language indicative of warmth and caring shown by teacher and students	○ Observer "scripts" lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic)
▪ Physical proximity	▪ Observer takes notes during pre- and post- observation conferences
▪ Politeness and encouragement	▪ Optional
▪ Fairness	○ Video
	○ Response to student work

2b Establishing a Culture for Learning

Indicators / "Look-fors"

- Belief in the value of what is being learned
- High expectations, supported through both verbal and nonverbal behaviors, for both learning and participation
- Expectation of high-quality student work
- Expectation and recognition of effort and persistence on the part of students
- Confidence in students' ability evident in teacher's and students' language and behaviors
- Expectation for all students to participate
- Use of variety of modalities
- Student assignments demonstrate rigor, include rubrics, teacher feedback, student work samples

Evidence/Evidence Source

- Observations
  - Observer "scripts" lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic)
  - Observer takes notes during pre- and post- observation conferences
  - Observer interacts with student about what they are learning
- Student Assignments
  - Teacher provides examples of student work
- Optional
  - Lesson plan
  - Video / Photo

2c Managing Classroom Procedures

Indicators / "Look-fors"

- Smooth functioning of all routines
- Little or no loss of instructional time
- Students playing an important role in carrying out the routines
- Students knowing what to do, where to move

Evidence/Evidence Source

- Observations
  - Observer "scripts" lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form
  - Observer takes notes on what is happening at what time, tracking student engagement / time on task, classroom artifacts, etc.
- Optional
  - Syllabus
  - Communications to Students / Parents

2d Managing Student Behavior

Indicators / "Look-fors"	Evidence/Evidence Source

▪ Clear standards of conduct, possibly posted, and possibly referred to during a lesson
▪ Teacher awareness of student conduct
▪ Preventive action when needed by the teacher
▪ Fairness
▪ Absence of misbehavior \ Absence of acrimony between teacher and students concerning behavior
▪ Reinforcement of positive behavior
▪ Culturally responsive practices
▪ Time on task
	▪ Observations
	  ○ Observer "scripts" lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic)
	  ○ Observer may tally positive reinforcement vs. punitive disciplinary action
	▪ Optional
	  ○ Disciplinary records/plans (content)
	  ○ Student / Parent Feedback
	  ○ Parent Communications

2e Organizing Physical Space

Indicators / "Look-fors"	Evidence/Evidence Source

▪ Pleasant, inviting atmosphere
▪ Safe environment
▪ Accessibility for all students
▪ Furniture arrangement suitable for the learning activities
▪ Effective use of physical resources, including computer technology, by both teacher and students
▪ Availability of relevant tools, such as mathematical manipulatives or a range of texts
	▪ Observations
	  ○ Observer "scripts" lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic)
	  ○ Observer records classroom physical features on standard form or makes a physical map
	▪ Optional
	  ○ Photos, Videos
	  ○ Online course structure

Domain 3: Instruction

3a Communication with Students

Indicators / "Look-fors"	Evidence/Evidence Source

▪ Clarity of lesson purpose
▪ Clear directions and procedures specific to the lesson activities
▪ Teacher uses precise language of the discipline when communicating with students
▪ Absence of content errors and clear explanations of concepts and strategies
▪ Student comprehension of content
▪ Communications are culturally responsive
▪ Assessed student work - specific feedback
▪ Use of electronic communication: Emails, Wiki, Web pages
▪ Formative assessments such as conferring logs, writer's notebooks, exit / entry slips and/or reader's response journals.
	▪ Observations
	  ○ Observer "scripts" lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic).
	  ○ Dialogue with students and accurate / precise dialogue
	  ○ Observer collects examples of written communications (emails / notes)
	▪ Assessed Student Work
	  ○ Teacher provides samples of student work & written analysis after each observation or end of semester
	▪ Optional
	  ○ Electronic Communication
	  ○ Handouts with instructions
	  ○ Formative Assessments

3b Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques

Indicators / "Look-fors"	Evidence/Evidence Source

▪ Questions of high cognitive challenge formulated by students and teacher
▪ Questions with multiple correct answers or multiple approaches, even when there is a single correct response
▪ Effective use of student responses and ideas
▪ Discussion, with the teacher stepping out of the central, mediating role
▪ High levels of student participation in discussion
▪ Student Work: Write/Pair/Share, student generated discussion questions, online discussion
▪ Focus on the reasoning exhibited by students in discussion, both in give-and-take with the teacher and with their classmates
▪ Use of citations of textual evidence
	▪ Observations
	  ○ Lesson plan
	  ○ Videos
	  ○ Student work
	  ○ Discussion forums
	▪ Optional
	  ○ Lesson plan
	  ○ Videos
	  ○ Student work
	  ○ Discussion forums

3c Engaging students in Learning

Indicators / "Look-fors"	Evidence/Evidence Source
▪ Activities aligned with the goals of the lesson	**Observations**
▪ Activities layered to provide multiple entry points for students	▪ Observer "scripts" lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic)
▪ Student enthusiasm, interest, thinking, problem-solving, etc.	○ Observer tracks student participation, time on task, examines student work, and teacher / student interactions
▪ Learning tasks that are authentic to content area; that require high-level student thinking and invite students to explain their thinking; that are culturally responsive	▪ Optional
▪ Students highly motivated to work on all tasks and persistent even when the tasks are challenging	○ Lesson plans
▪ Students actively "working," rather than watching while their teacher "works"	○ Student work
▪ Suitable pacing of the lesson: neither dragging out nor rushed, with time for closure and student reflection	○ Use of technology/instructional resources
▪ Student – student conversation	
▪ Student directed or led activities / content	

3d Using Assessment in Instruction

Indicators / "Look-fors"	Evidence/Evidence Source
▪ Teacher pays close attention to evidence of student understanding	▪ Observations
▪ Teacher poses specifically created questions to elicit evidence of student understanding	○ Observer "scripts" lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic)
▪ Assessments are authentic to content area	▪ Formative / Summative Assessment Tools
▪ Assessments are culturally responsive	○ Teacher provides formative and summative assessment tools or data
▪ Teacher circulates to monitor student learning and to offer feedback	▪ Optional
▪ Students assess their own work against established criteria	○ Lesson plans
▪ Assessment tools: use of rubrics	○ Conversations with evaluator
▪ Differentiated assessments – all students can demonstrate their learning	
▪ Formative / Summative assessment tools: frequency, descriptive feedback to students	
▪ Lesson plans adjusted based on assessment	

3e Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness

Indicators / "Look-fors"

- Incorporation of students' interests and daily events into a lesson
- Teacher adjusts instruction in response to evidence of student understanding (or lack of it)
- Teacher seizing on a teachable moment
- Lesson Plans: Use of formative assessment, use of multiple instructional strategies

Evidence/Evidence Source

- Observations
  - o Observer "scripts" lesson or takes notes on specially – designed form (paper or electronic)
  - o Takes notes on teacher taking advantage of teachable moments
- Optional
  - o Lesson plans
  - o Use of supplemental instructional resources
  - o Student Feedback

Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities

4a Reflecting on Teaching

Indicators / "Look-fors"

- Revisions to lesson plans
- Notes to self, journaling
- Listening for analysis of what went well and didn't go well
- Specific examples of reflection from the lesson
- Ability to articulate strengths and areas for development
- Capture student voice (survey, conversation w/ students)
- Varied data sources (observation data, parent feedback, evaluator feedback, peer feedback, student work, assessment results)
- Accurate reflections on a lesson
- Citation of adjustments to practice that draw on a repertoire of strategies

Evidence/Evidence Source

- Evaluator/Teacher conversations
  - o Guiding questions
  - o Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection.)
- Optional
  - o Grade book
  - o PD plan
  - o Student / parent survey
  - o Observations

4b Maintaining Accurate Records

Indicators / "Look-fors"

- Information about individual needs of students (IEPs, etc.)
- Logs of phone calls/parent contacts, emails
- Student's own data files (dot charts, learning progress, graphs of progress, portfolios)
- Routines and systems that track student completing of assignments
- Systems of information regarding student progress against instructional outcomes
- Process of maintaining accurate non-instructional needs

Evidence/Evidence Source

- Evaluator/Teacher conversations:
  - Guiding questions
  - Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)
- **Lesson plans/unit plans**
- Optional
  - Grade book
  - PD plan
  - Progress reports

4c Communicating with Families

Indicators / "Look-fors"

- Interaction with PTA or parent groups or parent volunteers
- Daily assignment notebooks requiring parents to sign off on assignments
- Proactive or creative planning for parent-teacher conferences (including students in the process)
- Frequent and culturally appropriate information sent home regarding the instructional program and student progress
- Two-way communication between the teacher and families
- Frequent opportunities for families to engage in the learning process

Evidence/Evidence Source

- Logs of communication with parents
- Teacher log of communication (who, what, why, when, "so what"?)
- Progress reports, etc.

4d Participating in a Professional Community

Indicators / "Look-fors"	Evidence/Evidence Source

▪ Inviting people into your classroom
▪ Using resources (specialists, support staff)
▪ Regular teacher participation with colleagues to share and plan for student success
▪ Regular teacher participation in professional courses or communities that emphasize improving practice
▪ Regular teacher participation in school initiatives
▪ Regular teacher participation in and support of community initiatives
	▪ Observations
	  ○ Notes taken during observation
	▪ Attendance at PD sessions
	▪ Optional
	  ○ PLC agendas
	  ○ Evidence of community involvement
	  ○ Evidence of mentorship or seeking to be mentored

4e Growing and Developing Professionally

Indicators / "Look-fors"	Evidence/Evidence Source

▪ Frequent teacher attendance in courses and workshops; regular academic reading
▪ Participation in learning networks with colleagues; freely shared insights
▪ Participation in professional organizations supporting academic inquiry
	▪ Evaluator/Teacher conversations
	  ○ Guiding questions
	  ○ Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)
	▪ Lesson plans/unit plans
	  ○ Observations
	  ○ Notes taken during observation
	▪ Optional
	  ○ PD plan
	  ○ PLC agendas
	  ○ Evidence of participating in PD
	  ○ Evidence of mentorship or seeking to be mentored
	  ○ Action research

4f Showing Professionalism

w	Evidence/Evidence Source

▪ Obtaining additional resources to support students' individual needs above and beyond normal expectations (i.e., staying late to meet with students)
 	
▪ Mentoring other teachers
 	
▪ Drawing people up to a higher standard
 	
▪ Having the courage to press an opinion respectfully
 	
▪ Being inclusive with communicating concerns (open, honest, transparent dialogue)
 	
▪ Having a reputation as being trustworthy and often sought as a sounding board
 	
▪ Frequently reminding participants during committee or planning work that students are the highest priority
 	
▪ Supporting students, even in the face of difficult situations or conflicting policies
 	
▪ Challenging existing practice in order to put students first
 	
▪ Consistently fulfilling district mandates regarding policies and procedures
	▪ Evaluator/Teacher conversations
	  ○ Guiding questions
	  ○ Documentation of conversation (e.g., notes, written reflection)
	
	▪ Optional
	  ○ Teacher provides documents to evaluator at end of year/semester
	  ○ Written reflection
	  ○ Parent and student survey
	  ○ Observing teacher interacting with peers/students/families
	  ○ Record of unethical behavior

Appendix D: Wisconsin Statutory Language Regarding Personnel Evaluations

20 Wisconsin Education Standards and personnel evaluation

Article X of the Wisconsin Constitution requires the state legislature to create conditions which make school districts "nearly uniform" so that educational opportunities for Wisconsin children do not depend on their location of residence. To meet this requirement, the legislature developed the 20 Wisconsin Education Standards (PI 8.01), which establish minimum expectations for each school district. The 17th standard (q) requires each district's school board to create an evaluation process for all licensed school personnel to occur in their "first year of employment and, at least, every third year thereafter." This is further elaborated as follows:

1. Each school district board shall establish specific criteria and a systematic procedure to measure the performance of licensed school personnel. The written evaluation shall be based on a board adopted position description, including job related activities, and shall include observation of the individual's performance as part of the evaluation data. Evaluation of licensed school personnel shall occur during the first year of employment and at least every third year thereafter.

2. The school district board shall ensure that evaluations, including those for purposes of discipline, job retention or promotion, shall be performed by persons who have the training, knowledge and skills necessary to evaluate professional school personnel. The school district board shall be responsible for the evaluation of the school district administrator under this subdivision.

Act 166 and Educator Effectiveness

In 2011, the Wisconsin legislature passed Act 166, which included new statutory language regarding the evaluation of school personnel (115.415) to supplement PI 8.01. Specifically, Act 166 requires:

1. the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) to develop a statewide process to evaluate teachers and principals; and

2. all Wisconsin school districts to use the new process (Educator Effectiveness) beginning in 2014-15 to evaluate teachers and principals as they fulfill their statutory requirements to evaluate personnel, as noted in PI 8.01.

Section 115.415. This part of Act 166 requires that DPI:

1. Shall develop an educator effectiveness evaluation system and an equivalency process aligned with the department's evaluation system for the evaluation of teachers and principals of public schools, including teachers and principals of a charter school established under s. 118.40 (2r), as provided in this section.

2. Each school board and the governing body of each charter school established under s. 118.40 (2r) shall evaluate teachers and principals in the school district or charter school beginning in the 2014-15 school year.

Note that Act 166 only impacts the process used to evaluate teachers and principals, but all other requirements noted in the 17th education standard (personnel evaluation) remain intact (i.e., districts must still create a process to evaluate all other licensed personnel; districts must evaluate all licensed personnel in their first year of employment and every third year thereafter; districts must ensure evaluators of licensed personnel are appropriately trained and qualified; and the school board shall evaluate the district administrator using a locally created process).
To support districts in meeting these remaining requirements, DPI has developed several evaluation processes for licensed personnel (other than teachers and principals) that align to the systems developed in Act 166, which districts can choose to use voluntarily (as opposed to developing their own processes).

Monitoring of District Compliance to Statutory Requirements

The Department of Public Instruction (DPI) will continue to evaluate and monitor districts' implementation of the Educator Effectiveness System to inform further refinements to the processes, as well as to help districts adhere to the statutory requirements. To learn more about the processes DPI will use to evaluate implementation, district staff may refer to the Educator Effectiveness District Policy Manual, developed by the Department of Public Instruction.

Educator Effectiveness SYSTEM

IMPROVE SUPPORT. IMPROVE PRACTICE. IMPROVE OUTCOMES.

SLO Quality Indicator Checklist

Quality Indicators	☑	Reflections/Feedback/Notes for Improvement
Baseline Data and Rationale		
The educator used multiple data sources to complete a thorough review of student achievement data, including subgroup analysis.		
The educator examined achievement gap data and considered student equity in the goal statement.		
The data analysis supports the rationale for the chosen SLO.		
The baseline data indicates the individual starting point for each student included in the target population.		
Alignment		
The SLO is aligned to specific content standards representing the critical content for learning within the educator's grade-level and subject area.		
The standards identified are appropriate and aligned to support the area(s) of need and the student population identified in baseline data.		
The SLO is stated as a SMART goal.		
Student Population		
The student population identified in the goal(s) reflects the results of the data analysis.		
Targeted Growth		
Growth trajectories reflect appropriate gains for students, based on identified starting points or benchmark levels.		
Growth goals are rigorous, yet attainable.		
Targeted growth is revisited based on progress monitoring data and adjusted if needed.		
Interval		
The interval is appropriate given the SLO.		
The interval reflects the duration of time the target student population is with the educator.		
Mid-point checks are planned, data is reviewed, and revisions to the goal are made if necessary.		
Mid-point revisions are based on strong rationale and evidence supporting the adjustment mid-course.		
Evidence Sources		
The assessments chosen to serve as evidence appropriately measure intended growth goals/learning content.		
Assessments are valid, reliable, fair, and unbiased for all students/target population.		
The evidence reflects a strategic use of assessment.		
Progress is continuously monitored and an appropriate amount of evidence can be collected in time for use in the End-of-Cycle Summary conference. (*Note: The amount of evidence available may vary by educator role*).		
Teacher-created rubrics, if used to assess student performance, have well-crafted performance levels that: • Clearly define levels of performance;		

• Are easy to understand; • Show a clear path to student mastery.		
Instructional (for teachers) and Leadership (for principals) Strategies and Support		
Strategies reflect a differentiated approach appropriate to the target population.		
Strategies were adjusted throughout the interval based on formative practices, interim assessments, and progress monitoring data.		
Collaboration with others—teachers, specialists, instructional coaches, Assistant Principals—is indicated when appropriate.		
Appropriate professional development opportunities are addressed.		
Scoring		
Accurately and appropriately scored the SLO.		
Score is substantiated by student achievement data and evidence of implementation process.		

SLO Rubric

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Goal Setting	Educator set inappropriate goal(s).	Educator set goal(s) based on analysis of required or supplemental data sources.	Educator set goal(s) based on analysis of all required and supplemental data sources.	Educator set rigorous and appropriate goal(s) based on a comprehensive analysis of all required and supplemental data sources.
Assessments Practices	Educator consistently used inappropriate assessment practices.	Educator inconsistently used appropriate assessment practices.	Educator consistently assessed students using appropriate assessment practices.	Educator consistently assessed students using strategic, appropriate, and authentic assessment practices.
Progress Monitoring	Educator did not monitor personal or student evidence/data.	Educator infrequently monitored personal and student evidence/data.	Educator frequently monitored personal and student evidence/data.	Educator continuously monitored personal and student evidence/data.
Reflection	Educator inconsistently and inaccurately reflected on student and personal evidence/data.	Educator consistently reflected on student and personal evidence/data.	Educator consistently and accurately reflected on student and personal evidence/data and made connections between the two.	Educator consistently and accurately reflected on student and personal evidence/data and consistently and accurately made connections between the two.
Adjustment of Practice	Educator did not adjust practice based on evidence/data or reflection.	Educator inconsistently and inappropriately adjusted practice based on evidence/data and reflection.	Educator consistently adjusted practice based on evidence/data and reflection.	Educator consistently and appropriately revised practice based on evidence/data and reflection.
Outcomes	Educator process resulted in no student growth.	Educator process resulted in minimal student growth.	Educator process resulted in student growth.	Educator process resulted in exceptional student growth.
Total				
HOLISTIC SCORE				

Appendix F: PDP and EEP Alignment

Initial educators (those in their first 3-5 years as building leaders) will be required to write yearly goals for their EEP (1 PPG and 1 SLO as part of their evaluation) as well as a 3-5 year Professional Development Plan (PDP) that lays out a strategy for professional growth that will lead to increased levels of student learning (for license renewal). While separate, there are considerable overlaps between these two processes and a principal would again be wise to align goals in order to maximize impact (and minimize work and frustration).

Both the EEP and the PDP require goal-setting. For evaluation purposes, principals will create a PPG (tied to the FfT) and SLO (tied to academic standards) each year. For licensing purposes, teacher will set one multi-year goal to improve teacher practice (tied to the WI Teacher Standards) that, if achieved, is likely to also positively impact student learning. Once this learning goal has been identified, the teacher will lay out the expected process that will be used to attain the desired learning. The goal and the process to meet the goal are called the PDP.

A teacher wishing to align the PDP and EEP processes would do well to choose the PDP goal wisely, to select an area for improvement that will likely need to be developed over time and that is also associated with personal passion. Most teacher PDP goals follow some version of the following format: I will learn, implement and assess the impact of –FILL IN THE BLANK WITH THE AREA OF IDENTIFIED LEARNING so that --FILL IN THE BLANK WITH WHAT CHANGE WILL OCCUR so that student learning will ultimately increase. As written, this goal has 3 main objectives (to learn about the area to be improved, to implement what was learned into practice, and to assess the impact of the changes on people, policies or systems) and the teacher would include ways that the objectives might be accomplished. These activities can be the links to the yearly goals, especially for the PPG and Strategies section of the SLO.